

### **REMARKS**

Currently, claims 1-10, 12, 13, 21, 31-32, and 34-36, including independent claims 1, 12, 13, and 31 are pending in the present application. In the Office Action, independent claims 1, 12, 13, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of the English title of CS 9005117 in combination with U.S. Pat. No. 5,620,773 to Nash, et al. However, Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* obviousness has not been established.

The title of CS '117 reads as follows, "Thin protective gloves are made of natural or synthetic rubber, coated internally with styrene! (sic) acrylate! (sic) copolymer and externally with colloidal silica." As admitted by the Office Action, the title of CS '117 fails to disclose several aspects of independent claim 1. For example, the title of CS '117 does not disclose that the colloidal silica particles are adhered to at least a portion of the outside surface of the matrix and partially embedded therein without extending through the thickness of the matrix. As such, the Office Action combines the teachings of Nash, et al. stating that it would be obvious to provide "that the colloidal [silica] is embedded in the surface, ... in order to provide improved strength upon curing the glove." Pg. 3, lines 8-11. However, Applications respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the cited references as attempted by the Office Action.

Nash, et al. is directed to securely embedding silica particles in the inside surface layer or donning layer of a glove. The particles are imbedded in the donning layer of the glove to provide a texturized surface which prevents blocking (i.e. prevents the gloves from sticking together) and provides a glove that is suitable for donning without the use of a lubricant such as powder. The teachings of Nash, et al. are directly opposite to those of the title of CS '117, which provides for colloidal silica coated on the external surface of the glove. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that one seeking to modify the external surface coated with colloidal silica of the title of CS '117 would not be motivated to look to the techniques of treating the donning layer of Nash, et al.

Even if combined, absent any motivation or suggestion to do so, Nash, et al. states that the textured surface has a lowered coefficient of friction than a smooth

surface which makes it easier for one to insert one's hand into the glove. As such, even if the silica particles are included in the external surface of the glove of the title of CS '117, Nash, et al. teaches embedding silica particles in the donning layer of a glove to lower the coefficient of friction. The teachings of Nash, et al. are directly opposite to the present invention, and therefore it is believed that Nash, et al. teaches away from the presently pending claim 1. For example, the present application teaches that applying particles to the outside surface of an elastomeric article, such as a glove, improves the gripping properties of the glove. When viewing Nash, et al. as a whole, it is respectfully submitted that it would not have been obvious the title of CS '117 with Nash, et al. in arriving at the presently pending claim 1.

Additionally, the title of CS '117 fails to disclose how the colloidal silica particles are attached to the natural or synthetic rubber. While the title of CS '117 does not specifically disclose that a separate binder material is present to affix the colloidal silica particles to the outside surface, the title of CS '117 fails to specifically exclude any separate binder material. In contrast, independent claims 1, 12, and 13 specifically require that no separate binder material affix the colloidal silica to the outside surface. In any event, Applicants respectfully submit that the title of CS '117 does not enable one of ordinary skill in the art to how coat the natural or synthetic rubber with colloidal silica particles without the use of a separate binder material.

Applicants also submit that claims 8, 13, 21, 31, 32, and 34-36 are patentable over the cited references, in any combination. Nowhere do the cited references teach or suggest that the colloidal silica particles are electrically conductive. Even if true, the Office Action fails to recognize that the limitation requiring the silica particles be electrically conductive must be considered. According to the present application, the use of electrically conductive particles allows localized high levels of electrical charge, such as static charge or tribocharge, to be dissipated through conduction along particle-to-particle contacts. Pg. 8, lines 5-7. The cited references simply fail to teach, suggest, or even recognize the advantages of electrically conductive silica particles present in

the articles. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable over the cited references.<sup>1</sup>

It is believed that the present application is in complete condition for allowance, and favorable action is respectfully requested. Examiner Miggins is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned, however, should any issues remain after consideration of this Amendment.

Please charge any additional fees required by this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 04-1403.

Respectfully requested,

DORITY & MANNING, P.A.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Alan R. Marshall  
Registration No. 56,405

P. O. Box 1449  
Greenville, SC 29602-1449  
Phone: (864) 271-1592  
Facsimile: (864) 233-7342

Date: August 23, 2006

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicants also note that the Examiner has previously allowed these claims, stating that no applicable prior art teaches or suggests articles or processes having the conductive features. This conclusion is in contrast with the Office Action's assertion that anything is electrically conductive if enough voltage is applied.